SUPREME COURT MINUTES FRIDAY, JULY 7, 2006 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

S143445 H030019 Sixth Appellate District ANCHOR (DEAN ROBERT) ON H.C. Time extended to grant or deny review to August 15, 2006.

S026408

PEOPLE v. LYNCH (FRANKLIN)

Extension of time granted to file appellant's reply brief September 5, 2006. After that date, only two further extensions totaling about 115 additional days will be granted. Extension is granted based upon Deputy State Public Defender Ellen J. Eggers's representation that she anticipates filing that brief by December 31, 2006.

S042346

PEOPLE v. JONES (BRYAN)

Extension of time granted to September 14, 2006, to file respondent's brief. Extension is granted based upon Deputy Attorney General Karl T. Terp's representation that he anticipates filing that brief by September 14, 2006. After that date, no further extension is contemplated.

S048763

PEOPLE v. NELSON (SERGIO D.)

Extension of time granted to September 5, 2006, to file appellant's reply brief.

S049626

PEOPLE v. HAJEK & VO

Extension of time granted to September 5, 2006, to file appellant Vo's opening brief. After that date, no further extension is contemplated. Extension is granted based upon counsel Doron Weinberg's representation that he anticipates filing that brief by September 2006.

S056891

PEOPLE v. THOMPSON (JAMES)

Extension of time granted to August 31, 2006, to file the respondent's brief. After that date, only no further extension is contemplated. Extension is granted based upon Deputy Attorney General Melissa Mandel's representation that she anticipates filing that brief by August 31, 2006.

S058472

PEOPLE v. BENNETT (ERIC WAYNE)

Extension of time granted to September 8, 2006, to file appellant's reply brief. After that date, only three further extensions totaling about additional days 160 are contemplated. Extension is granted based upon counsel Tamara P. Holland's representation that she anticipates filing that brief by February 15, 2007.

S068536

PEOPLE v. MCWHORTER (RICHARD)

Extension of time granted to August 9, 2006, to file respondent's brief. Extension is granted based upon Deputy Attorney General Brook Bennigson's representation that he anticipates filing that brief by August 9, 2006. After that date, no further extension is contemplated.

SAN FRANCISCO JULY 7, 2006 1079

S076999

PEOPLE v. SOUZA (MATTHEW A.)

Extension of time granted to September 8, 2006, to file the appellant's reply brief. After that date, only three further extensions totaling about 170 additional days will be granted. Extension is granted based upon Deputy State Public Defender C. Delaine Renard's representation that she anticipates filing that brief by March 1, 2007.

S077524

PEOPLE v. SALAZAR (MAGDALENO)

Extension of time granted to September 8, 2006, to file appellant's opening brief.

S080947

PEOPLE v. ENRACA (SONNY)

Extension of time granted to September 5, 2006, to file appellant's opening brief.

S136708

WADE (TOBY T.) ON H.C.

Extension of time granted to July 13, 2006, to file respondent's informal response and proposed order.

S136861

JABLONSKI (PHILIP CARL) ON H.C.

Extension of time granted to September 5, 2006, to file petitioner's reply to informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus.

S137389

WILLIAMS (BOB) ON H.C.

Extension of time granted to July 24, 2006, to file the reply to the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus. After that ate, no further extension is contemplated. Extension is granted based upon counsel Charles M. Bonneau's representation that he anticipates filing that document by July 24, 2006.

S144631

FRANCIS v. DEPARMENT OF JUSTICE

Transferred to CA 2 for consideration in light of *Hagan v. Superior Court* (1962) 57 Cal.2d 767. In the event the Court of Appeal determines that this petition is substantially identical to a prior petition, the repetitious petition must be denied.

S144720

BENAVIDES v. S.C. (PEOPLE)

Transferred to CA 2 for consideration in light of *Hagan v. Superior Court* (1962) 57 Cal.2d 767. In the event the Court of Appeal determines that this petition is substantially identical to a prior petition, the repetitious petition must be denied.

S144855

MALLICK v. S.C. (PEOPLE)

Transferred to CA 1 for consideration in light of *Hagan v. Superior Court* (1962) 57 Cal.2d 767. In the event the Court of Appeal determines that this petition is substantially identical to a prior petition, the repetitious petition must be denied.